

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:
DATE FILED: 6/30/2021

-----X
MICHAEL PRINCE,

Plaintiff,

-v-

CITY OF NEW YORK et al.,

Defendants.
-----X

20-cv-1935 (VSB)

ORDER

VERNON S. BRODERICK, United States District Judge:

I am in receipt of the motion to withdraw as counsel filed by John Grill, attorney of record for Plaintiff Michael Prince ("Prince"). (Doc. 25.) Local Civil Rule 1.4 requires that an attorney seeking to withdraw must serve any application on the client, while the motion to withdraw here only includes a "CC" indicating that Prince was served by email and certified mail. Local Civil Rule 1.4 also indicates that an attorney seeking to withdraw must indicate whether they are asserting a retaining or charging lien, which Plaintiff's filing does not include. Finally, while Plaintiff's counsel's motion indicates that "there has been a significant erosion of the attorney-client relationship," it does not actually indicate whether or not Plaintiff's counsel believes there is a "fundamental disagreement" or "irreconcilable conflict between attorney and client," as is referenced in some of the case citations. Accordingly, it is hereby:


ORDERED that Plaintiff's counsel's motion at Document 25 is DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if Plaintiff's counsel still seeks to withdraw, he is directed to submit another filing indicating (1) whether or not he is seeking a retaining or charging lien, (2) whether or not he believes there is a "fundamental disagreement" or "irreconcilable conflict" between him and Prince, and (3) Prince's position on his potential

withdrawal. Plaintiff's counsel is further directed to serve a copy of his motion to withdraw at Document 25 on Prince, as well as any subsequent motion to withdraw, and file affidavits of service on the docket.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 30, 2021
New York, New York


Vernon S. Broderick
United States District Judge